POLITICAL AND MUNICIPAL LEGISLATION IN 1900.[1]

During the period covered by this review, October 1, 1899, to October 1, 1900, thirteen states held regular[2] and four held extra[3] sessions. Only six states have annual sessions[4] and all but eight of those having biennial sessions, hold them in odd years,[5] so that there is only about half as much state legislation in even as in odd years. The total number of acts and resolutions passed during this off year was 5,886, of which Virginia passed 1,485; New York, 777; Maryland, 758; Ohio, 636; Massachusetts, 594; New Jersey, 201; South Carolina, 181, and Kentucky, 40.

General vs. Special Legislation.—In the *Annual Summary and Index of State Legislation*, issued by the New York State Library, 1,469 of these 5,886 laws are summarized. The *Annual Summary* includes all general laws and a few special and temporary laws of general interest, so that it is safe to say that three-fourths of the laws passed were special. Of the 1,485 laws passed by Virginia only 152, or a little more than one-tenth, were general, while in New Jersey over four-fifths of the 201 laws passed were general. The difference is doubtless due to the restrictions on special legislation contained in the New Jersey constitution. In Virginia the only restriction on special legislation is the provision that the legislature may not grant divorces, change names, direct the

[1] For previous articles on "Political and Municipal Legislation" see ANNALS for May, 1896 (Vol. VII, pp. 411-425); for March, 1897 (Vol. IX, pp. 231-245); for March, 1898 (Vol. XI, pp. 114-190); for March, 1899 (Vol. XIII, pp. 212-229), and for March, 1900 (Vol. XV, pp. 16-26).

[2] Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina and Virginia.

[3] California, Michigan, North Carolina and Texas.

[4] Georgia, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island and South Carolina.

[5] Vermont, which holds its regular session in October of even years, does not come within the period covered by this review.

sale of estates of persons under legal disability, or grant relief in any other case where courts or other tribunals have jurisdiction.[1] Until 1875 the New Jersey constitution merely prohibited the granting of divorces and the sale of land of persons under legal disability by special act, but in that year an amendment was adopted restricting special legislation within narrow limits.[2] This amendment provides that no general law shall embrace any provision of a special character, that no special bill shall be passed unless public notice of intention to apply for it has been previously given, and that special acts shall not be passed bearing on any of the following matters:

Laying out, opening, altering and working roads or highways.

Vacating any road, town-plot, street, alley or public grounds.

Regulating the internal affairs of towns and counties; appointing local officers or commissions to regulate municipal affairs.

Selecting, drawing, summoning or empaneling grand or petit jurors.

Creating, increasing or decreasing the percentage or allowance of public officers during the term for which said officers were elected or appointed.

Changing the law of descent.

Granting to any corporation, association or individual any exclusive privilege, immunity or franchise whatever.

Granting to any corporation, association or individual the right to lay down railroad tracks.

Providing for changes of venue in civil or criminal cases.

Providing for the management and support of free public schools.

The legislature shall pass general laws providing for the cases enumerated in this paragraph, and for all other cases which, in its judgment, may be provided for by general laws. The legislature shall pass no special act conferring corporate powers, but they shall pass general laws under which corporations may be organized and corporate powers of every nature obtained, subject, nevertheless, to repeal or alteration at the will of the legislature.

The effect of these restrictions is very strikingly shown by a comparison of the number and kind of acts passed by the New Jersey legislature during the three-year period

[1] Virginia Constitution, 1869, art. 3, § 20.

[2] New Jersey Constitution, 1844, art. 4, § 7.

1872–1874, preceding the adoption of the amendment, and the period 1876–1878, after its adoption. During the first period the average number of acts passed was 624, of which 111 were classified in the volume of session laws as general and 513 as special. For the second period the average number of acts was 219, of which 188 were classified as general and thirty-one as special. The adoption of the amendment seems, therefore, to have reduced the total volume of legislation 65 per cent, and the number of special acts 94 per cent, and to have increased the number of general acts 70 per cent.

Virginia voted in May to hold a constitutional convention. It will be interesting to see whether the convention, in drafting a new constitution, will follow the now almost universal practice of restricting special legislation.

Florida adopted a constitutional amendment in November prohibiting the creation of corporations, except universities and ship canals by special act. Of the 242 acts and resolutions passed by Florida in 1899, twenty-five were special acts relating to corporations. The amendment should, therefore, diminish the present volume of legislation about 10 per cent.

The Mississippi legislature has exercised a certain degree of self-control in the matter of special legislation by authorizing the auditor and land commissioner to settle claims for taxes erroneously paid, correct errors in land descriptions, cancel patents to lands in certain cases and make rebates.

In New York a constitutional amendment was proposed by the legislature of 1899 but not repassed by the legislature of 1900 prohibiting the passage of a special or private bill granting exemption from taxation.[1] The need of further constitutional restrictions or of the exercise of legislative self-control in the matter of special legislation in New York is very great. During the period 1894–1899 there was an annual average of 589 special to 243 general acts passed.

[1] N. Y., 1899, p. 1605.

There was an average of 183 special city, fifty-three special village, twenty-six special town and twenty-nine special county acts, making in all 291 special acts dealing with local governmental organization. November 3, 1874, a number of constitutional amendments restricting special legislation were adopted and while they reduced the annual output of legislation about one-half, the natural increase in special legislation in lines not touched on in the amendments, has, in the course of a quarter century, brought up the annual average to a point only about 10 per cent below that prevailing previous to the adoption of the amendments. For the three years 1871–1873 there was an annual average of 904 acts and for the years 1876–1878 an average of but 447, while for the past seven years the average has been 832.

By the passage of a few general laws the annual output of legislation in New York might be greatly reduced. Each year an average of twenty-seven amendments to the fish and game laws are passed, seventeen of which apply to but one or two counties. A general law conferring on county boards of supervisors power to pass fish and game regulations, subject to the approval of the state commissioners of fisheries, game and forests, would considerably relieve the legislature. Moreover, many of the details now prescribed by the fish and game laws might well be left to regulations of the state board. The state board of railroad commissioners now exercises an extensive quasi-judicial authority that obviates the necessity for numerous special acts, and this method of control could be profitably extended to a number of other fields.

The effect of the prohibition of special city legislation on the volume of legislation has been shown by the experience of Wisconsin. In November, 1892, a constitutional amendment was adopted prohibiting the incorporation of a city or the amendment of its charter by special act. As a result of this amendment the total number of laws passed has been reduced more than one-quarter and the number of pages of

law more than one-half. During the six years 1886–91 there was an annual average of 266 laws, covering 993 pages, while for the period 1893–98 there was an annual average of 191 laws, covering 412 pages.

In this connection the experience of Illinois is also instructive. It is a great state with varied interests, and, like New York, has had to deal with the problem of a big and rapidly growing city. It has a general law for the incorporation of all cities, most of the provisions of which apply to all alike. Instead of going into great detail the law merely prescribes the general organization and gives to the city council power to adapt the more detailed organization to the changing needs of the city.

With an annual average of 183 special city acts the suspensive veto over such acts given to the mayor of cities of the first class and to the mayor and council of other cities by the constitution of 1894, seems to have proven totally inadequate to cope with the evil.

Annual Sessions.—Rhode Island has been holding two sessions of its legislature yearly, an annnal session being held at Newport beginning on the last Tuesday in May, and an adjourned session at Providence beginning in January. The January session held at Providence has usually lasted into May, after which the Newport session, beginning the last Tuesday in May, has usually lasted till the latter part of June. A constitutional amendment was adopted at the November election providing for a single annual session at Providence beginning on the first Tuesday in January.[1]

Statutory Revision.—In 1889 New York created a statutory revision commission to revise certain of the general statutes of the state. It was supposed that the commission would complete its task in two or three years at most, but the work of revision has been continued from year to year and is still unfinished. The scope of the undertaking was soon broadened to cover the entire field of statutory law. A

[1] R. I., 1900, j. r. 1.

number of the revision bills prepared by the commission have not been acted on by the legislature, partly owing to the fact that a great deal of new law is contained in them and the legislature is unwilling to accept them without careful examination. Much dissatisfaction having arisen with the slow progress of the work and with the proposed method of revising the code of civil procedure, the commission was abolished[1] and the question of revision referred to a joint committee. The committee is making a careful examination of the subject and will report to the legislature of 1901.

In 1896 South Carolina created the office of code commissioner.[2] The commissioner is elected by the legislature for ten years and must prepare a complete revision of the general statutes and the code of civil procedure in 1901 and every ten years thereafter. He receives a salary of $400 a year.

During 1900 official compilations of statutes were issued by Missouri, Nevada, North Dakota, West Virginia and Wyoming and unofficial compilations were issued for Illinois, Kansas and North Carolina.

Drafting of Bills.—In 1893 it was made the duty of the New York Statutory Revision Commission, just referred to, "on request of either house of the legislature, or of any committee, member or officer thereof, to draft or revise bills, to render opinions as to the constitutionality, consistency or other legal effect of proposed legislation, and to report by bill such measures as they deem expedient."[3] The services of the commission have been made use of to a very considerable extent in the drafting of bills. For the session of 1899 the commission reports that it prepared about five hundred bills at the request of members of the legislature, besides examining and rewriting a large number originally prepared elsewhere. With the abolition of the commission

[1] N. Y., 1900, ch. 664.
[2] S. C., 1896, ch. 1.
[3] N. Y., 1893, ch. 24, § 2.

during the past year there is as yet no statutory provision for the performance of this most important and useful work, but it is understood that three of the assistants on the former commission will be retained by the legislature of 1901 to continue it. For the drafting of bills special technical knowledge, that can only be acquired by much practice, is essential. Each bill must be adjusted to an existing intricate system, and its object must be expressed concisely, clearly and with legal precision. It is, moreover, highly important, for clearness and ease of construction, that all acts passed should be alike as to form. Great Britain and many of the British colonies and provinces have official draftsmen, who draft most of the bills at the request of members.

Besides New York, South Carolina is the only state in the Union that has provided any similar authority. In the latter state at the session of 1868, immediately after the adoption of a new constitution, an act was passed requiring the attorney-general, when requested by either branch of the general assembly, to attend during their sessions and give his aid and advice in the arrangement and preparation of legislative documents and business.[1] In 1880 the attorney-general was authorized to require the assistance during legislative sessions of the state solicitors in the eight judicial districts of the state.[2] They must, under the direction of the attorney-general, supervise the engrossing and enrolling of bills passed and assist the attorney-general in the drafting of bills, and in other work connected with the session. They receive the same *per diem* as do members of the legislature. In 1900 Massachusetts provided that the attorney-general shall, on request, give advice to legislative committees as to the legal effect of proposed measures.[3]

Uniform Legislation.—In 1890 New York created a uniform legislation commission, and at present similar commis-

[1] S. C., Statutes at Large, V. 14, No. 2.
[2] *Id.*, *V.* 17, No. 249.
[3] Mass., 1900, ch. 373.

sions exist in thirty-two states and territories. In 1896 the national conference of state commissioners on uniform legislation recommended for adoption by the various states a general act relating to negotiable instruments. This act has now been adopted by fifteen states[1] and the District of Columbia, but none of these were added to the list in 1900.

The national conference, held at Saratoga Springs in August, 1900, recommended the adoption by the various states of a uniform law relative to divorce procedure. The proposed law provides that no divorce shall be granted for any cause, arising prior to the residence of the complainant or defendant in the state, which was not a ground for divorce in the state where the cause arose; that no person shall be entitled to a divorce for any cause arising in the state, who has not been an actual resident of the state for one year, or for any cause arising out of the state unless the complainant or defendant has resided in the state for two years. Service of notice on defendant is provided for with special care. No divorce is to be granted solely on default, or solely on admissions by the pleadings, or except on hearing before the court in open session. After divorce either party may marry again, but in cases where notice has been given by publication only and the defendant has not appeared, no decree for divorce becomes final till six months after the decision. The purpose of the proposed law is first, to do away with migratory divorces; second, to prevent the granting of speedy decrees against absent defendants who may be ignorant of any suit pending; and third, to do away with the interstate confusion arising from some few states forbidding re-marriage while a great majority of the states permit it.

Lobbying—Massachusetts, Wisconsin and Maryland have attempted to secure publicity relative to lobbying. The Massachusetts act, after which the acts of the other two

[1] Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Viginia, Washington, Wisconsin.

states are closely modeled, was passed in 1890 and amended in 1891, 1895 and 1896.[1] The following is a summary of the original act:

Every person, private or public corporation or association employing any person to promote or oppose directly or indirectly the passage of any legislation, shall cause the name of the person so employed to be entered on a legislative docket. Two such dockets must be kept by the sergeant-at-arms, one for legislative counsel and the other for legislative agents. In the docket for legislative counsel must be entered the names of counsel employed to appear at a public hearing before a committee, and any regular legal counsel of corporations or associations who act or advise in relation to legislation. In the docket for legislative agents must be entered the names of all other agents employed in connection with any legislation. In these dockets must also be entered the names of all employers of counsel or agents, the date of employment, the length of time that it is to continue and the special subject or subjects of legislation to which the employment relates. No person may be employed as a legislative counsel or agent for a compensation dependent in any manner on the passage or defeat of any proposed legislation or on any other contingency connected with the acts of the legislature. Within thirty days of the closing of the session every person, private or public corporation or association whose name appears on the legislative dockets as employing legislative counsel or agents, must render to the secretary of the commonwealth a complete and detailed sworn statement of all expense incurred in connection with the employment of legislative counsel or agents, or in connection with promoting or opposing legislation in any manner. Such reports when filed are open to public inspection. Violation of any provision of the act is punished by a fine of from $100 to $1,000. The employment by a city or town of its solicitor to represent it before the legislature or any of

[1] Mass., 1890, ch. 456; 1891, ch. 223; 1895, ch. 410; 1896, ch. 342.

its committees, is expressly exempted from the provisions of the act. The act was amended in 1895 and 1896 so as to require counsel and agents to file a written authorization from the person or corporation by whom they are employed.

The Wisconsin act was passed in 1899.[1] It applies to persons, corporations or associations, and specially exempts municipalities and other public corporations. With this exception the act substantially follows that of Massachusetts. The Maryland act was passed in 1900 and like that of Wisconsin follows very closely that of Massachusetts.[2] It however contains an entirely new clause providing that the governor, whenever any bill is presented for his approval and he has reason to believe that in connection with its passage improper expenses have been incurred, may require any or all legislative counsel and agents and their employers to render a complete and detailed sworn statement of all expenses incurred.

In 1897 Tennessee passed an act declaring lobbying a felony and defining it as personal solicitation of any kind not addressed solely to the judgment.[3] In the same year West Virginia prohibited lobbying on the floor of either house while the legislature is in session.[4]

Constitutions.—New Hampshire and Virginia have voted to hold constitutional conventions. The present constitution of New Hampshire was adopted in 1792 and has since been amended but three times. In 1851 a constitutional convention proposed three amendments, one of which was accepted by the people; the convention of 1876 proposed thirteen amendments, all but two of which were adopted; the last convention held in 1889 proposed seven amendments, five of which were adopted. In Virginia an extra session of the legislature convened January 23, 1901, to provide for elect-

[1] Wis., 1899, ch. 243.
[2] Md., 1900, ch. 328.
[3] Tenn., 1897, ch. 117.
[4] W. Va., 1897, ch. 14.

ing delegates to the convention. The present constitution was adopted in 1869.

Suffrage.—The constitutional amendment submitted to vote in North Carolina to disfranchise the illiterate negro, was adopted and goes into effect in July, 1902.[1] The proposed plan is similar to that adopted by Louisiana in 1898,[2] and makes ability to read and write a section of the constitution a qualification for voting. This provision applies to whites and blacks alike, but there is a proviso that it shall not apply to any person entitled to vote in any state prior to January 1, 1867, or to the lineal descendant of such person who registers before January 1, 1908. It is, in effect, an ingenious device to disfranchise illiterate negroes without also disfranchising illiterate whites and still keep within the letter of the fifteenth amendment, providing that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

Mississippi adopted an educational qualification in 1890, which went into effect January 1, 1892, and the South Carolina convention in 1897 adopted an alternative educational or property qualification, which went into effect January 1, 1898. Florida, Georgia and Alabama are the only states remaining in the black belt of the South that have not restricted the franchise by constitutional provision, and Florida has accomplished practically the same result through a peculiar method of voting.

In June, 1900, Oregon rejected a woman suffrage amendment to the constitution by a vote of 28,402 to 26,265. Woman suffrage exists in four states, Wyoming, Idaho, Utah and Colorado.

Primaries.—California adopted a constitutional amendment in November giving the legislature full power to regulate primaries.[3] It may prescribe special qualifications for voting at primary elections or delegate this power to

[1] N. C., 1900, ch. 2.
[2] La. Const., 1898, art. 197.
[3] Cal., 1899, j. r. 35.

the political parties, and it may pass primary laws applying only to political divisions having a certain designated population. The amendment was submitted because of a supreme court decision declaring unconstitutional the primary law of 1897, on account of the provision prescribing the qualifications for voting.[1] The Legislature of 1899 that submitted the amendment also passed a new primary law.[2] Under this act primary elections are conducted by officers appointed by the local election commissioners and are held at the same time and place for all parties casting 3 per cent of the vote. An official ballot with party columns and blank spaces to be filled in with names of delegates preferred is provided, and the expense of the primaries is a public charge. The Louisiana legislature has adopted a law that shows none of the recent tendency toward state control.[3] It provides simply for the regulation of primaries by party committees, subject to simple requirements as to notice, officers, etc.

Voting Machines.—The voting machine is gradually winning its way into public favor. It was used with great satisfaction in many New York cities at the November presidential election. With the voting machine returns can be announced in a remarkably short time, and the opportunity for manipulation and fraud is much reduced. It secures a secret ballot in all cases and can be operated without assistance, even by an illiterate. Ingenious methods have been devised to violate the secrecy of the Australian ballot, but it seems that the voting machine is proof against all such schemes. With it the only way to bribe, and be sure that value is received, is to bribe to stay away from the polls, and this form of bribery can be abolished by compulsory voting.

The first state law authorizing the use of automatic machines was passed by New York in 1892, allowing towns to use the Myers automatic ballot cabinet at elections of town

[1] Spier *v.* Baker, 52 P. 659.
[2] Cal., 1899. ch. 32, 46, 48, 52.
[3] La., 1900, ch. 133.

officers.[1] In 1893 Michigan[2] and Massachusetts[3] permitted the use of voting machines at local elections, and in 1894 New York[4] authorized their use at all elections. Michigan[5] passed a similar law in 1895, Massachusetts[6] in 1896, Minnesota[7] in 1897, Ohio[8] in 1898 and Indiana[9] and Nebraska[10] in 1899. During the past year Rhode Island has created a voting machine commission, to examine machines and make regulations for their use by cities and towns.[11] Machines are to be bought by the secretary of state at not exceeding $250 each and furnished to cities and towns on application, and for this $15,000 is appropriated. In Iowa the use of voting machines has been authorized at all elections and a commission to examine voting machines created.[12] In 1895 Connecticut authorized the use of McTammany and Myers machines at local elections.[13] The first permanent state voting machine commission was established in New York in 1897.[14] Massachusetts[15] and Ohio[16] followed in 1898.

Corrupt Practices.—Kentucky has made it unlawful for corporations to contribute to campaign funds.[17] Similar laws were passed by Florida,[18] Missouri,[19] Nebraska[20] and Tennessee[21] in 1897.

[1] N. Y., 1892, ch. 15.
[2] Mich., 1893, ch. 98.
[3] Mass., 1893, ch. 465.
[4] N. Y., 1894, ch. 764, 765.
[5] Mich., 1895, ch. 76.
[6] Mass., 1896, ch. 489.
[7] Minn., 1897, ch. 296.
[8] O., 1898, p. 277.
[9] Ind., 1899, ch. 155.
[10] Neb. 1899, ch. 28.
[11] R. I., 1900, ch. 744, 794.
[12] Ia., 1900, ch. 37.
[13] Ct., 1895, ch. 263, 333.
[14] N. Y., 1897, ch. 450.
[15] Mass., 1898, ch. 378, 548.
[16] O., 1898, p. 277.
[17] Ky., 1900, ch. 12.
[18] Fla., 1897, ch. 24.
[19] Mo., 1897, p. 108.
[20] Neb., 1897, ch. 19.
[21] Tenn., 1897, ch. 18.

Civil Service Reform.—The revised charter of New Orleans, adopted in 1896, contained stringent provisions for the adoption of the merit system. It provided for the appointment, by the mayor, with the consent of the council, of a board of three civil service commissioners for terms of twelve years. The salary of the commissioners was fixed at $3,000, and no person was eligible for appointment who had been a candidate for or who had held any municipal office within four years, and no member of the commission could, during his term of office, be a candidate for or hold any state, national or local office, nor be a member of any municipal political committee or convention, nor be eligible for any state office within four years of the expiration of his term of office. The mayor could remove any commissioner for misconduct on rendering a statement of the cause to the council. The names of persons passing examinations were to be certified in order of their relative excellence as determined by examination, without reference to priority of time of examination. No officer or employee in the classified service could be removed except for cause on written charges and after hearing, the charges to be investigated by the board of civil service commissioners or by some officer or board appointed by the commission, but any officer could suspend a subordinate for a period not exceeding thirty days.

The stringent provisions of this law are all nullified by that of 1900. This act reorganizes the board so that it shall consist of the mayor, treasurer, comptroller and two members appointed by the mayor who shall hold office during the term of the mayor. All candidates securing an average of 70 per cent on examination are eligible to appointment. The appointment is on probation for six months, and after that time entitles the appointee to hold the position until the expiration of the term of office of the appointing officer. The board is required to hold an examination within thirty days after the opening of each new municipal administration. In every such general examination all persons, either

holding or desiring to hold positions in the classified civil service, are obliged to participate. A long list of officers and employees is exempted from the provisions of the act. All lists of candidates eligible for appointment prepared by the former board are rendered void and all offices and positions subject to the provisions of the act are vacated. The act can scarcely be considered an application of the merit system as it seems especially designed to secure a clean sweep with each new administration.

Municipal Government.—A joint legislative committee has been appointed in Iowa to revise and codify special assessment laws and such other municipal laws as it may deem necessary.[1] In New York the Governor appointed a commission of fifteen persons to revise the charter of New York city,[2] and its report has been recently submitted to the legislature. The bill prepared by the Ohio municipal code commission, appointed in 1898, and which was submitted to the legislature of 1900, failed to pass.

Municipal Monopolies.—The law of New Mexico of 1897, vesting cities and towns with power to regulate the price of gas, electric light and water, has been declared unconstitutional by the state supreme court, on the ground that the Legislature cannot delegate such power to consumers without providing for a judicial investigation of the reasonableness of the rates established.[3] Iowa has authorized cities and towns to establish heating plants, assess taxes for them and fix regulations for corporations or individuals supplying heat.[4] Louisiana has authorized municipalities to expropriate private gas and electric light plants,[5] and Texas has made it unlawful for cities and towns to lease or sell water systems except by vote of the electors.[6]

[1] Ia., 1900, ch. 176.
[2] N. Y., 1900, ch. 465.
[3] N. M., 1897, ch. 57, Agua Pura Co. *v.* Las Vegas, 60 P. 208.
[4] Ia., 1900, ch. 19.
[5] La., 1900, ch. 111.
[6] Tex., 1900, ch. 6.

Counties.—New Jersey has adopted an act for the reorganization of the government of counties of 150,000.[1] The act provides for a county supervisor and board of chosen freeholders, elected by the people. The county supervisor is the chief executive officer and may recommend to the board of chosen freeholders such measures as he deems necessary. It is his duty to see that the laws and ordinances of the county are enforced, to exercise constant supervision over the conduct of all subordinate officers, to examine into all complaints against them for violation or neglect of duty, and if any officer be found guilty of charges brought against him he may be suspended or removed by the county supervisor. The ordinances and resolutions of the board of chosen freeholders are presented to the county supervisor for approval, and if he disapproves, a two-thirds vote is necessary for passage. The board of chosen freeholders appoints a county physician, engineer, warden of penitentiary, warden of county jail, superintendent of almshouse, superintendent of each hospital, penitentiary physician, jail physicians and physicians for each hospital, and such other officers and agents for the transaction of county business as may be determined by resolution of the board. Members of the board receive a salary of $500 and the county supervisor a salary of $2,500.

In Ohio a state commission on fees of county officials has been established, consisting of the secretary of state, auditor and attorney general. It is required to prepare schedules of legal fees, and to report biennially to the legislature.[2]

ROBERT H. WHITTEN.

New York State Library, Albany, N. Y.

[1] N. J., 1900, ch. 89.
[2] O., 1900, p. 40.